

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/690,670	IWANAMI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Timothy P. Solak	3746

All Participants:

(1) Timothy P. Solak.

Status of Application: Allowance

(3) _____.

(2) James Barlow.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 April 2005

Time: PM

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

44

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

I question James Barlow about the wording of Claim 44, stating that it was unclear as to how functioning as a motor caused functioning as a generator.

James Barlow stressed his opinion, that I was miss-reading the claim, stating that the claim set forth different operational modes the unit could run in; namely as a motor, as a generator or in an unloaded mode. James Barlow suggested the claim language, while not perfect was satisfactory and did not warrant any changes.

I agreed with James Barlow.